

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-7 and 9-19 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.¹

By way of summary, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-7 and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708 to Craig et al. (hereinafter "Craig") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,298 to Tso et al. (hereinafter "Tso") and A. Ortega et al., Soft Caching: Web Cache Management Techniques for Images, 1997 IEEE SIGNAL PROCESSING SOC'Y 475 (hereinafter "Ortega").

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicants and Applicants' representative wish to thank Examiner Truong for the courtesy of the personal interview granted on June 17, 2010. During the interview, Claim 17 was discussed. Examiner Truong explained his position that an MPEG image describes a vendor.

Comments differing from those presented during the interview are included herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 9-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Craig in view of Tso and Ortega. In light of that rejection, independent Claims 1 and 12-14 have been amended to clarify the claimed inventions and to thereby more clearly patentably define over the applied references.

¹ The amendments to independent Claims 1 and 12-14 find support at least in Claim 17 and in the specification in the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16.

Amended Claim 14 is directed to an information processing apparatus including, in part, “a network device that . . . receives . . . identification information corresponding to content data, from an external apparatus . . . , the identification information identifying a vendor; . . . and a controller configured . . . to remove all files from the memory except for files of the vendor.” Craig, Tso, and Ortega fail to disclose or suggest those features.

Craig concerns a system for caching dynamically generated content.² The Office Action admitted Craig fails to specifically disclose that “the identification information identifies a vendor.”³

To remedy that deficiency, the Office Action relied on Tso. Tso concerns a logical function generator that “can output a disable signal to set the removal factor equal to zero--effectively eliminating the decompressed MPEG image from the cache.”⁴

As discussed during the interview, the Office has taken the position that an MPEG image describes a vendor. Based on that position, Tso merely describes eliminating a file of a vendor. Tso does not disclose or suggest “a controller configured . . . to remove all files from the memory except for files of the vendor,” as recited in amended Claim 14.

Ortega concerns recoding of images in a cache so that lower resolution versions of the images can be stored and made available to clients.⁵ It is submitted that Ortega is silent regarding “a controller configured . . . to remove all files from the memory except for files of the vendor,” as recited in amended Claim 14.

Thus, Craig, Tso, and Ortega, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “a controller configured . . . to remove all files from the memory except for files of the vendor,” as recited in amended Claim 14.

² Craig, col. 1, ll. 6-9.

³ Office Action at 12.

⁴ Tso, col. 7, ll. 14-18.

⁵ Ortega, 477.

Thus, it is submitted that independent Claim 14 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of Craig, Tso, and Ortega for at least the foregoing reasons.

It is additionally submitted that independent Claims 1 and 12-13 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguish over any proper combination of Craig, Tso, and Ortega for at least reasons analogous to those set forth above with regard to Claim 14.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added new Claims 18-19 to set forth the invention of Claim 14 in a varying scope. It is respectfully submitted new Claim 18 finds support at least in Claim 14 and new Claim 19 finds support at least in the specification in the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16. Thus, no new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that new Claims 18-19 are allowable by virtue of their dependencies from Claim 14 and for the more detailed features presented by the new claims.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is patentably distinguished over the applied references. The application is therefore in condition for allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Brian R. Epstein
Registration No. 60,329